HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:59979
WP No. 29810 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010654132026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 28TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

WRIT PETITION NO. 29810 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. RAMASWAMY,
   AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,
   S/O. LATE VENKATARAMANAPPA @
   VENKATARAMANA REDDY,

2. GOPAL @ GOPALAREDDY,
   AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,
   S/O. LATE VENKATARAMANAPPA @
   VENKATARAMANAREDDY,

   BOTH ARE RESIDING AT
   VALEPURA VILLAGE, VARTHUR HOBLI,
   BENGALURU EAST TALUK,
   BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT - 560 087.

...PETITIONERS

Digitally signed by CHAYA S A
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

(BY SMT.RASHMI K., ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. SHIVARAJU M K., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA,
   REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
   M. S. BUILDINGS,
   BENGALURU - 560 001.
   REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
   BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT,
   KEMPE GOWDA ROAD,
   BENGALURU - 560 009.

3. THE ASST. COMMISSIONER,
BENGALURU NORTH SUB-DIVISION,
KANDAYA BHAVAN, K.G.ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 009.

4. THE TAHSILDAR,
BENGALURU EAST TALUK,
K.R. PURAM,
BENGALURU - 560 036.

5. KRISHNA REDDY,
MAJOR
S/O. LATE MUNIYAPPA @
MUNIYAPPA REDDY,
VALEPURA VILLAGE, VARTHUR HOBLI,
BENGALURU EAST TALUK,
BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT - 560 087.

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.SHAMANTH NAIK, AGA FOR R1 TO R4;
SRI.RANGANATH REDDY, ADVOCATE FOR R5)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO A) I QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 24.08.2026 PASSED BY THE SECOND RESPONDENT IN REV. PET. NO.587/2025 IN RESPECT OF THE LAND BEARING SY. NO.27/1 MEASURING 1 ACRE 20 GUNTAS OUT OF 1 ACRE 36 GUNTAS SITUATED AT VALEPURA VILLAGE, VARTHUR 1 HOBLI, BENGALURU EAST TALUK, VIDE ANNEXURE A AND ETC.,

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

ORAL ORDER

In this writ petition, petitioners are assailing the order dated 24.08.2026 (Annexure-A) passed by the respondent No.2.

2. Having taken note of the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties and the finding recorded by the respondent-authority would indicate that the petitioners herein have sold the land in question as per the registered Sale Deed dated 18.09.2003. The respondent No.2 after considering the entire material on record has rightly passed the impugned order, which is just and proper and therefore, I am of view that no interference is called for, in this writ petition.

Accordingly, writ petition is dismissed.

SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE

PSJ
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 16